

REMARKS

Claims 13, 16 and 18-28 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 13 and 24 are amended and claims 25-28 are added. Support for new claims 25-28 can be found in the specification, for example, at paragraphs [0135]-[0136]. Thus, no new matter is added.

Applicants appreciate the courtesies shown to Applicants' representative by Examiners Airapetian and Gart in the May 31, 2007 personal interview. Applicants' separate record of the substance of the interview is incorporated into the following remarks.

I. The Claims Define Patentable Subject Matter

The Office Action rejects claims 13, 16, 19 and 20-22 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 5,748,484 to Cannon et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,259,405 to Stewart; rejects claim 18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Cannon and Stewart, and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0208442 to Cockrill et al.; rejects claim 23 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Cannon and Stewart, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,174,579 to Slyster et al.; and rejects claim 24 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Cannon and Stewart, and further in view of Slyster. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

None of the applied references, alone or in a permissible combination, teaches or suggests each and every feature recited in the rejected claims. For example, neither Cannon nor Stewart teaches or suggests "automatically notifying the customer of at least one of receipt of the electronic personalized product producing data and completion of the personalized product requested, wherein the automated method incorporates the request and producing of the personalized product taking place within a facility where the customer is located, and delivery of the personalized product to the customer at the location where the personalized product is produced," as recited in independent claim 13, and as similarly recited in independent claim 24 (emphasis added).

The Office Action acknowledges that Cannon does not teach an automated method incorporates the request and producing personalized product within a geographic area or facility, and delivery of the personalized product to the customer at the location where the personalized product is produced. Furthermore, Stewart does not remedy the deficiencies of Cannon.

Stewart does not disclose "wherein the automated method incorporates the request and producing of the personalized product within a facility where the customer is located." Stewart merely discloses a service provider that finds the best printing device based on the geographic information received and requirements of the print job (col. 21, lines 5-14). Thus, Stewart does not disclose the claimed automated method.

Further, with respect to claim 21, neither of the applied references teaches or suggests "calculating upon receipt of each wireless communication, a number of wireless communications already received and operation conditions of a personalized product producing device, an estimated time of completion of the requested personalized product; and automatically returning a wireless communication including the estimated time of completion to each of the customers."

The Office Action acknowledges that Cannon does not disclose this feature. However, Stewart does not remedy Cannon's deficiencies.

The Office Action asserts that Stewart discloses this feature at col. 4, lines 24-26. However, Stewart merely discloses at col. 4, lines 24-26 that integrating portable computing devices with networks such that routine tasks, such as travel routing, may be accomplished more efficiently. Stewart further discloses that this allows a mobile user to employ their portable computing device more effectively. Nowhere does Stewart disclose calculating upon receipt of each wireless communication an estimated time of completion, and automatically returning a wireless communication with an estimated time of completion, as recited in claim 21.

Further, Cockrill and Slyster do not remedy the deficiencies of Cannon and Stewart. The Office Action cites Cockrill and Slyster for only their alleged teachings of authenticating each of the customers based on customer information and printing personalized labels/stickers, respectively.

Thus, for at least these reasons, independent claims 13 and 24 are patentable over the applied references. Further, claims 16 and 18-23, which variously depend from independent claim 13, are also patentable over the applied references, for at least the reasons discussed above, as well as for the additional features they recite. Withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

II. New Claims 25-28

Claims 25-28 are patentable over the applied references for at least their respective dependence on claims 13 and 24, as well as for the additional features they recite. For example, none of the applied references teaches or suggests "the facility including a plurality of producing facilities" where the product is produced in the facility where the customer is located, as recited in claims 25 and 27. Furthermore, none of the applied references teaches or suggests "each of the plurality of producing facilities producing a different personalized product," as recited in claims 26 and 28.

III. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Randi B. Isaacs
Registration No. 56,046

JAO:RBI/hms

Attachment:
Request for Continued Examination

Date: June 28, 2007

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--